



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,495	06/03/2005	Fumiaki Ito	Q88234	8371
23373	7590	04/02/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			MCINTOSH III, TRAVISS C	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			1623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/02/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/537,495	ITO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	TRAVISS C. MCINTOSH III	1623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2005.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 June 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/18/05 &amp; 6/3/05</u> .                                    | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed 6/3/2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 50 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim is drawn to "the use of claim 18, however, claim 18 is drawn to a method. Appropriate correction is required. Changing the claim to read "A method as claimed in claim 18...".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for inhibiting SGLT1 and treating diseases associated with hyperglycemia does not reasonably provide enablement for preventing diseases associated with hyperglycemia. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims without undue experimentation.

Undue experimentation is a conclusion reached by weighing the noted factual considerations set forth below as seen in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding a fair evaluation of an appropriate combination of the factors below, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

These factors include:

- (A) The breadth of the claims;
- (B) The nature of the invention;
- (C) The state of the prior art;
- (D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
- (E) The level of predictability in the art;
- (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
- (G) The existence of working examples; and
- (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

**The breadth of the claims/Nature of the Invention:**

The claims are drawn to methods of treating or preventing diseases associated with hyperglycemia and compositions comprising the same. In the absence of an explicit definition in Applicant's specification, "Prevention" as recited in the instant claims, is interpreted to mean the complete and total blocking of all symptoms of a disorder for an indefinite period of time. Any therapy which merely reduces the number or severity of symptoms, or which is effective for a period shorter than the subject's remaining lifespan, is considered to be ineffective at preventing a disorder.

**The state of the prior art:**

The sodium-dependant glucose cotransporter SGLT has been characterized in the prior art and inhibitors have been developed against SGLT. For example, Hossain et al. (Reference included with PTO-892) discloses that administering the SGLT1 inhibitors (catechin for example) lowers blood glucose by non-competitive inhibition and is effective as a supplement for diabetic patients. Prevention of any disorder in the sense being used herein is not a recognized clinical outcome in the art.

**The level of predictability in the art:**

Prevention of a disease is not the same as treatment of said disease. In order to prevent a disease, as opposed to merely delaying or reducing its symptoms, a dosing must either render the subject completely resistant to said disease after a single treatment or a limited number of treatments, or else, when continued indefinitely, continue to completely suppress the occurrence of said disease. In order to practice a preventative method, one of skill in the art must know the

answer to several questions in addition to the effectiveness of the therapy in short-term relief of symptoms, including: 1) What is the duration of a single course of therapy? How often must the therapy be administered to completely suppress the disease? 2) Does the subject develop tolerance to the therapy over time? Does the disease eventually progress to a point where the therapy is unable to completely suppress all symptoms? For example, will a metastatic cancer eventually adapt to overcome treatments directed to preventing it from metastasizing into the bone? Or will a case of osteoporosis or rheumatoid arthritis ultimately progress to a point where symptoms develop regardless of which therapy is administered. 3) What are the long-term effects of the therapy? Does it cause progressive damage to the kidneys, liver, or other organs? Does the active agent accumulate in the subject's tissues? Is the minimum dose necessary to completely prevent the disease safe for long-term administration? Are there any steps that can be taken to reduce side effects? Additionally, because various physiological systems are interdependent and affect one another, any hypothetical preventative treatment would have to be broad-based and treat all of the various causes of a disorder. For example, because osteoporosis is, in the majority of cases, caused at least in part by a reduction in estrogen levels, a true preventative treatment for osteoporosis must be capable of preventing or reversing menopause in a subject. For this reason, many therapies which are suitable for short-term relief of symptoms are not suitable for lifelong prevention of disease. For example, antibiotics, chemotherapeutics, and antiviral drugs are not normally administered to healthy subjects in order to prevent the development of infection or cancer. Furthermore, a tissue can degenerate for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to, exposure to toxins, chronic viral infection, autoimmune attack, and deposition of amyloid

protein. To be fully successful, a preventative method would have to guard against all of these possible insults.

**The amount of direction provided by the inventor:**

Applicant's specification discloses assays by which the SGLT1 inhibitory activity of various compounds can be determined. However, no guidance is given for determining which diseases can and cannot be treated by the claimed method. No guidance is given in the specification suggesting any reason to believe that administration of an SGLT1 inhibitor can completely prevent all diseases associated with hyperglycemia.

**The existence of working examples:**

No working examples are given for the treatment of any disease. Note that lack of working examples is a critical factor to be considered, especially in a case involving an unpredictable and undeveloped art such as the treatment or prevention of broad categories of disease with a single agent. See MPEP 2164.

**The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure:**

As mentioned above, the short-term usefulness of a therapy for relief of symptoms is no guarantee of its long-term usefulness for prevention of disease. Because no guidance is given for the use of the claimed therapeutic method for the long-term prevention of disease, one skilled in the art wishing to practice the invention would be unable to do so without first gathering information as to the long-term effectiveness of the therapy. In particular, one skilled in the art, in order to practice the invention for prevention of disease, would need to know whether the preventative effect remains potent over the long term. In order to answer these questions in the absence of any existing data, one skilled in the art, in order to practice the invention, would

undertake long-term animal tests, preferably over a period of years, preferably involving a relatively long-lived experimental animal such as dogs or monkeys, or a human clinical trial. Animal experiments include, along with induction of the disease state, administration of the potential pharmaceutical compound and collection and analysis of data, additional burdens associated with compliance with animal welfare regulations, care, feeding, and other maintenance of the animals, dissection of dead animals to collect data, and disposal of dead animals after the protocol is finished. Administering the claimed compounds for a period of years to a suitable subject population is an undue amount of experimentation needed in order to practice the full range of the claimed invention. As prevention in the full sense is an extremely high bar for any clinical outcome, there is no reason to believe that the therapy would be successful, and any actual success would be a surprising and unpredictable result.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hossain et al. (“Polyphenol-Induced Inhibition of the Response of Na<sup>+</sup>/Glucose Cotransporter Expressed in *Xenopus* Oocytes”, Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 2002, 50, 5215-5219).

Hossain et al. discloses compounds which inhibit SGLT1 and their use in treating diabetes patients and may help prevent hyperglycemia (see abstract and paragraph 2 on page 5215). It is noted that while the document is silent to any inhibitory effects of GLUT2 and/or GLUT5, however since the Office does not have the facilities for preparing the claimed materials and comparing them with prior art inventions, the burden is on Applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference between the claimed product and the product of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and *In re Fitzgerald et al.*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). Since these compounds are shown to have noncompetitive inhibition of SGLT1, it would be believed that they inherently comprised the non-inhibiting GLUT characteristics.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TRAVISS C. MCINTOSH III whose telephone number is (571)272-0657. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia A. Jiang can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Traviss C. McIntosh III

/Traviss C McIntosh III/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1623  
March 28, 2008